

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 16, 2001

LB 366

bill, but the residences are not, and this bill would not make the residences subject to the same requirements as the nonresidence farm buildings on that farm?

SENATOR RAIKES: If I said that, Senator, I was incorrect. For example, a barn, for whatever that may describe to you, on a farmstead, that is not inhabited by people, would not be subject to...or, I guess I can't say never, because the county may take a prerogative...but would not be subject to building code requirements, to 911 addresses, and in fact to submissions of...well, they do have to be reported for property tax assessment, but it's a little different mechanism. So...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. But...so for our purposes, those buildings are exempt from what this bill would place on the residences?

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes. Yes. That's correct, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Now that we know the non...which buildings are exempt from the requirements of this bill, a residence on a farm would be covered by the terms of this bill, if a county chose to do so. Is that...

SENATOR RAIKES: That's correct, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...correct?

SENATOR RAIKES: Yeah. Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And there was apparently no opposition to this bill, with that understanding that people have. Is that true?

SENATOR RAIKES: There was some discussion on Select File, Senator. And Senator Bromm offered an amendment which I think improved the bill. But there was agreement, I think, once that was adopted.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What was his amendment, if you don't mind?